



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

PF

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/767,108   | 01/22/2001  | James Brian Vrotacoe | 600.1118            | 9101             |
| 23280  | 7590        | 10/09/2003           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC<br>485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR<br>NEW YORK, NY 10018 |             |                      | NGUYEN, ANTHONY H   |                  |
|  |             | ART UNIT             |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      |                     | 2854             |
| DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003  |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                        |                        |                      |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>  |
|                        | 09/767,108             | VROTAOE, JAMES BRIAN |
|                        | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>      |
|                        | Anthony H Nguyen       | 2854                 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a)a) approved or b)b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_.

*Anthony H Nguyen*

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' argument are not persuasive since the "union" 16e which joints two pieces as argued by applicant functions as a flow restrictor that alters the fluid flow. Obviously, the fluid flow is altered because the inside diameter of the "union" 16e is smaller than the line the supply line 16 inside the body as shown in Fig.1 of Fellows. The pressure inside the line is reduced when the fluid flows from the smaller diameter to a larger diameter and is inherently increased when a hole on the surface of the printing cylinder is covered. Kay is cited to show a specific flow restrictor as recited in claims 3-5 and 7-19. As explained in the previous Office Action, Kay teaches the conventional use of the fluid flow restrictor which alters the fluid flow and creates vortices (Kay, Figs.2 and 9), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing cylinder of Fellows by providing a fluid flow restrictor as taught by Kay et al. to permit more precise control the fluid flow in the cylinder for mounting or replacing a printing sleeve. Therefore, the combination of Fellows and Kay renders obvious the structure as recited in claims 3-5 and 7-19.